

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/016,363	11/02/2001	Deborah A. Altemuehle	286402-00001-1 3859		
75	590 04/27/2005	EXAMINER			
David C. Jenkins			SMITH, TRACI L		
Eckert Seamans	S Cherin & Mellott, LLC				
44th Floor		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
600 Grant Stree	t	3629			
Pittsburgh, PA 15219			DATE MAILED: 04/27/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		<del></del>						
Office Action Summary		Application N	Application No. Applicant(s)					
		10/016,363		ALTEMUEHLE ET AL.				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		Traci L Smith		3629				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply								
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.  SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, holy within the statutory will apply and will expected, cause the application	nowever, may a reply be time minimum of thirty (30) days bire SIX (6) MONTHS from to to to become ABANDONED	ely filed will be considered timel he mailing date of this co				
Status								
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on							
	☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.							
3)	•							
Disposit	ion of Claims							
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>							
Applicat	ion Papers							
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 November 2001</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	are: a)⊠ accepe drawing(s) be ho	eld in abeyance. See the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CF	FR 1.121(d).			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	43.1	☐ Interview Summary (	(PTO 413)				
2) Notice 3) Information	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 er No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail Da		O-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/016,363 Page 2

Art Unit: 3629

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to papers filed on November 2, 2001.

- 2. Claims 1-9 are pending.
- 3. Claims 1-9 are rejected.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claims 1, 4 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

- (1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and
- (2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result
- 6. As to technological arts recited in the preamble, mere recitation in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implication of employing a machine or article of manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breathe life and meaning into the preamble. In order for the claims to pass muster they must clearly identify that a computer is doing the steps claimed. It is the examiners belief that the applicant intends the methods to be performed by a computer, therefore suggests putting in such wording in the claims. The examiner is able to reasonably interpret the claims in a broad sense of the method being done by

Application/Control Number: 10/016,363

Page 3

Art Unit: 3629

two people sitting at a desk. It is suggested that the applicant shows where information is transmitted over a network and/or server as well as how and where the data is being manipulated by a machine process. This could assist the applicant in overcoming the current 35 USC 101 rejection.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

- 7. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent 6, 556 974; D'Alessandro; A method for evaluating current business performance.
- 8. As to claims 1 and 4 D'Alessandro teaches a method of
  - a. Defining survey categories and gathering feedback from both employees and non-empolyees (C. 2 I. 60-65).
  - b. Organizing feedback in rating report format(C. 3. I. 1-3).

Application/Control Number: 10/016,363

Art Unit: 3629

9. As to claim 9 D'Alessandro teaches a method that compares one survey to another as well as using ratios which is another form of comparisons. (C. 9 I. 26-30 and 46-50).

Page 4

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 11. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
  - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 12. Claims 2-3 and 4-8 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Patent 6, 556 974; D'Alessandro.
- 13. As to claims 2-3 and 4-8 D'Alessandro teaches a method of supplying the employees and non-employees with several survey formats and storing the results.(C. 5 l. 65-67 & C. 7 l. 4-6). D'Alessandro fails to teach the survey format in a "form letter" it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to expand the formats in

Application/Control Number: 10/016,363

Art Unit: 3629

Page 5

information being input.

Conclusion

which information the user enters their response so as to allow for more extensive

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Traci L Smith whose telephone number is 572-272-

6809. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:00 am-4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 571-272-6812. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

tls